Exit Interview with Barbara Bergman, White House Counsel's Office

Interviewer: David Alsobrook, Presidential Papers Staff

October 21, 1980, Room 128, Old Executive Office Building

Transcriber: Lyn B. Kirkland

Alsobrook: Barbara Bergman, White House Counsel's Office, October 21st, 1980, approximately 3:00 pm, in room 128 of the Old Executive Office Building, interviewer is David Alsobrook, Presidential Papers staff.

Barbara, will you say "testing" so I can see how well I pick you up?

Bergman: Testing, testing.

Alsobrook: Alright, one more time.

Bergman: Testing,

Alsobrook: Ok again.

Bergman: Testing.

Alsobrook: Alright.

...phone calls or anything, just tell me and I can, I can turn it off.

Bergman: Ok.

Alsobrook: Ok. Barbara, first, when did you come to work at the White House?

Bergman: I started work here the first week of October about a year ago, 1979. I started the first week that Mr. Cutler did.

Alsobrook: Did Mr. Cutler hire you for this job? Is that how it happened?

Bergman: Yes, yes, he did. I was working in the Public Defender's Service here in the District and I had, for, prior to that, worked at Mr. Cutler's law firm and he had asked me to come on board here when he decided he was going to work here and I decided I didn't want to miss an opportunity like that, so I took him up on it.

Alsobrook: Oh, I see. Do you remember the first day you were on the job here?

Bergman: Yes.

Alsobrook: What was that like?

Bergman: No one knew quite what to do with me as I remember. [Laughs] Lloyd had just started, as I said, and he was still trying to figure out what support staff was like, where everything was located, what he viewed his role as being, much less what he viewed everybody else's role as being and there was, it was a period of defining everybody's area of interest. And, as a result, on the first day I came no one knew quite what I was going to be working on or where my office was or all kinds of very nitty gritty little details. And, by the end of the week we corrected almost all of that but it took a little while.

Alsobrook: So it was a time of confusion.

Bergman: Very much so. Very much a transition period.

Alsobrook: Well, as your job came into sharper focus what did you find you were doing most of the time?

Bergman: It varied. There were certain projects which I found I did routinely. The counselor's office handles a lot of just plain routine legal work that came in, requests for use of the Presidential seal, use of the President's photograph by commercial advertisers, which we try to discourage as much as possible. And then there were clearances. Our office handled all security, FBI clearances and conflict of interest clearances for all presidential appointees, as well as the White House staff. The security clearances for White House staff, conflicts of interest came in then for the presidential appointees, and so we had to review all of those. And as I had been here a while, we started, I was asked to take over part of the load doing that because there were a lot of presidential appointments and it had to be done quickly so the nominations for most people could be sent up to the Senate. So I found I spent well maybe a third or a quarter of my time working on those types of things. Someone had to do them. Freedom of Information Act requests. Cause we weren't subject to that, arguably, but we would have to handle sending letters out to people explaining that we were not and why. Those sorts of things, routinely you'd always have a few on your desk to work on, then there would be just all kinds of legal questions would come in from staff members.

Alsobrook: Oh, yes.

Bergman: And I did not work on election questions, or Hatch Act questions, or political activity questions but when we get phone calls, I then would briefly try to find an answer for them. Those were the typical routine types of things we would get. We also had financial disclosure forms under the Ethics in Government Act which our office distributed to the proper people and then collected and evaluated and I worked on that with another attorney in the office. That was the routine. The rest of my time, which was most of my time, would be spent on particular projects which were timely...things that would come up unexpectedly that we needed legal research done on. Coordination with different agencies. Lots of times the White House, President would be sued and there'd be litigation and there would be issues of executive privilege which would

come up in terms of what documents we would produce and not produce on particular litigation and reference was made to come up with a coherent policy toward our, when we would submit executive privilege and why. And so, I worked on quite a few cases dealing with that.

Alsobrook: What was the policy? I mean, was there a policy or did this vary from cases to case?

Bergman: The general policy that internal memoranda, particularly memoranda that go to the President, we would normally claim privilege on simply because of the possible chilling effect.

Alsobrook: Right.

Bergman: Among White House advisors, if they knew or thought there was a possibility that their documents, which hopefully would be open and frank and honest and very candid, would someday be handed over to litigation or just generally and we felt, at least, the cases that I worked on, the decisions were made that these types of documents should be protected unless there were extraordinary reasons not to and usually they were and usually we didn't have too much trouble with that. In terms of other documents, internal memoranda that did not go to the President or that were from other agencies to White House staff, there really wasn't a particularly coherent policy on that and it varied tremendously depending on what the case was, what the particular documents were and whether or not they contained the kind of advice which would find its way into that presidential decision memo and that was pretty much decided, at least, again, in the cases that I was involved in, on basically evaluating those documents in that particular case. I found it very frustrating not to have a particularly coherent policy towards that other second class of documents and that made it very difficult because you had to read every single document that came in in all these cases after first collecting them from all over, which was also another problem in and of itself. So, that was part of the job.

Alsobrook: So, in collecting documents, did you have to go to the staff secretary? Exactly what was the procedure?

Bergman: We would go, we would get a copy of the requests for documents and hopefully we had been apprised of what was going on so that we had had some time to figure out who here had been involved in whatever decision and where they were now were if they had left and where those files were and then we would basically, first we'd check with Central Files and would have to get with Frank Mathews and dig through what they had, and bring it up and review it and then we would contact each of the individual staff members who we thought in any way had been involved with it and have them go through their files and we would go through and review those when they presented them to us and we just tried to find as many possible sources of documents as we could. One of the problems was that many people don't send their files to Central Files and that they're kept in filing cabinets in each of the individual offices and then when people leave the government they may be sent down, but they're be sent down in boxes which are not

opened by Central Files but merely are listed as being provided by this individual which made it very difficult.

Alsobrook: I'll bet.

Bergman: And it took a lot of time, and then there was an additional file for the presidential handwriting file so if there was any possibility of any of those documents, so we had to check those, that file. So it would take a while and on a massive document request it took a long time.

Alsobrook: Ummm. Did you ever go back to see how other previous administrations had handled executive privilege? Do you know?

Bergman: We used the Justice Department a lot for that simply because they have sort of a continuing expertise that lasts beyond any particular administration. And the Office of Legal Counsel has a staff of, I would guess, 20 to 25 attorneys who are very good and many of whom have been around for long enough to really know what the practice has been in the past. And we usually, in close cases, we call upon them. They would come over with us and review the documents and then we would discuss with them as to what approach we should take and why. And I believe they are in the process of doing a facility research memo on how it had been used in the past beyond some original research they had already done. I haven't seen it yet. I don't know what the status of it is but it would be very helpful.

Alsobrook: Do you think it is possible that because staff would fear that their views may become public they'll tend to give the President face to face information rather than put it in writing? I'm sure you've heard this question before.

Bergman: I...it would be totally my own opinion.

Alsobrook: Right, that's all this question is.

Bergman: There is no basis for it. I think on political questions, that that was much more likely to happen. I think on a lot of governmental issues that come up which the President decides, usually, quite frankly, I don't think, particularly, for political reasons, most of them, I think it is more likely to be in a memo because there's just so much that has to go in to the President and the time is so limited that it would be very difficult to present a lot of that information just face to face. I'm sure his closest advisors do much more of that but I have been amazed at how much gets put into memos, because...

Alsobrook: OK. You know, of all these types of cases that you've worked on is there perhaps one that you found especially interesting?

Bergman: Well, there were others. Actually there is another category that I really haven't gone into when I was talking about things coming up as it went along. Ever so often there would be special projects, you know, emergencies. The Billy Carter matter comes to mind as the most Nljc.oh.Bergman B

recent. That was certainly not expected and ended up with a substantial portion of our office working on it full time almost around the clock and it took about five or six weeks, of that kind, those kinds of hours and that kind of involvement. It was interesting and it was an interesting experience to work on simply because it was an opportunity to work with Al Moses who was brought over as special counsel on the project and it was interesting to see how everything was pulled together by the different agencies to present to the Senate subcommittee and how the reports were written and at the same time it was frustrating because I'd seen all of the documents. I knew there was nothing there and it was taking so much of my time [Laughs] and that becomes very frustrating. But, I think from the way things worked out, it's worked out all right, and the time was well spent and it had to be spent just to answer the questions that had been raised. But that's the most obvious example of those types of crisis projects that come along. There have been a few others, that... When the Iranian hostage situation first happened, and the invasion of Afghanistan shortly after that, there were, needless to say, a great many meetings, planning sessions as to strategy and lots of legal questions that came up fairly quickly and needed answers fairly quickly and Justice and Legal Counsel and different agencies worked together in trying to come up with the best way, what the approach should be and, for example, the freeze order under YEPA, the freezing Iranian assets and the Treasury regulations implementing those regulations and there is still an on-going series of litigation involving people who have claims against those assets and whether or not the pre-judgement attachments were valid. There's been a whole series of projects that have come up based on those initial crises in a way, almost a year ago.

Alsobrook: As a non-lawyer, what's a pre-judgement attachment? [Both laugh.]

Bergman: It's, it's, well how can I explain it. I'm not an expert on property law. I answer more of the procedural questions in this case, but it's basically when a freeze order, in effect, is put on property so that it cannot be disposed of pending resolution of who has title or interest in that property at a subsequent trial. It is to keep someone from taking the property away without jurisdiction, or disposing of it, so that you cannot, there is nothing left for you to give a judgement in, and so pre-judgement attachment says we think that you have enough proof, enough of an argument on the merits that we will keep this property as it is, pending a final decision as to whether you are entitled to it or part of it or how and these cases were up in New York and what has happened was that the various American businesses had filed pre-judgement attachment claims against the Iranian assets and the question became, are those valid under New York law in light of all the subsequent fees were filed before the freeze order, so there were all kinds of legal questions, and it became tied up with our problems here in terms of efforts to negotiate for the release of the hostages and what impact that litigation might have on those efforts, and it became an area of concern, needless to say, to a lot of people in the administration who were involved in dealing with that issue and it's still on-going on.

Alsobrook: Right. Did you also have to get involved with immigration and exit visas on various questions about Iranians in this country?

Bergman: I didn't work on that very much. I believe another attorney in our office did and also worked on the issues of parade permits for Iranian demonstrators and anti-Iranian groups, which was another issue of concern. At that point we had so much going on in this office that we really had to split up parts of the Iranian problem because no one person could really keep track of it all, it was happening so quickly, and so I worked more on the assets and I believe Joe and Michael worked more, and perhaps Patrick, on the permits and the immigration status. Again, all in conjunction with Justice and different agencies depending on what their particular involvement was.

Alsobrook: That sounds like about 12 twenty hour days.

Bergman: [Laughs] That was hectic, I have to admit. That and Billy Carter were probably the two most hectic times that I remember since I've been here.

Alsobrook: [Laughs.] OK. Could you tell me, this again, some of this is opinion really, how is a position here in the counselor's office different from an attorney's position, say in an agency or in a private firm like you had before you came here?

Bergman: Well, I can compare it. I had two jobs basically before this one. One was with Mr. Cutler's law firm where I was an associate for a year and the other was with the Public Defender's Service, which is in essence, at core, a governmental agency, although it does criminal defense work, which is somewhat different from most government agencies. And one of the differences I found, at least from my experience, is that we had very, a much smaller number of lawyers here. When I first started we had one, two, three associates, two associates, a senior associate, two deputy counselors which were five attorneys working with Mr. Cutler. That was it. And when I was at the law firm there were one hundred and thirty attorneys and when I was at the Public Defender's Service there were 50 attorneys. And the other problem, or the difference I found, was that the building, the whole, all the other offices, everybody else here, are not geared for legal work. They are here for all kinds of other reasons and I was very much accustomed to working in a building or series offices where it was pretty much all lawyers, support staff was used to working with lawyers, the library was a law library and all of a sudden I found myself more in just a government building with barely a law library, if that at all, which caused us all a lot of problems. We've complained and it's been improved and hopefully will continue to improve, but we really didn't have the legal resources we needed to research problems. We had support staff, in terms of secretaries were very good, but there's a turn over fairly quickly because we had detailees come on, we had people leave for various reasons and we lost some continuity that way.

There was, there's no, there is a messenger service here but not particularly reliable, as far as I am concerned, or prompt. And, at the law firm we had messengers 24 hours a day who would deliver items immediately for us or pick items up and have them brought to us and I think, I think Lloyd was also very upset by finding that he would have messages that he assumed had been delivered which were somewhere in transit for six hours and he simply wasn't used to that and I wasn't either because I, when I worked at the firm I had gotten spoiled. Even at PDS we didn't have nearly as much support staff but what we had was very good, and you get spoiled. And that was very, a different adjustment coming here, so that was a difference.... what other differences....

There's a different, it was a whole different type of work style, from my standpoint, in the sense that it's much more crisis oriented, it's much more problem solving, much less initial advice, although at sometimes when we knew issues were coming up and we knew they would have to be dealt with and you had some time to prepare for that, but many times you'd read in the newspaper about something happening and you'd come to work and find you were working on it. [Alsobrook laughs.] And the problem with that is that I had done criminal defense work and I had done corporate securities and tax work at the law firm. I had never done international law. I had never done a great deal of the types of things I found on my desk. I didn't know, I'd never read the SEC Government Act or the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, and then all of a sudden, you know, a quarter of what I was doing involved those acts, and so I didn't have a lot of experience and background in a lot of the issues that I found I had to deal with quickly and that's frustrating, but it's also exciting because you have, you don't find yourself bogged down in long term projects which you find in a lot of large law firms over in Virginia and such, yep. You don't find yourself spending two months in the law library writing a massive law review on a subject because you don't have time for that and on the other hand it is frustrating because you really want to do the job right and you want to get the right answer, and you want to be sure that everything is accurate and that you've thought it through and all those are luxuries you, that I didn't always feel that I had. I didn't always have the resources here, I didn't always have the time, and you were not dealing with minor little problems that if you made a mistake would not have any impact on anyone and that's a little frightening.

Alsobrook: Did you ever get a memo back or anything that you worked on that Mr. Cutler had sent in to the President, you know, with his notations on it or anything?

Bergman: Actually, I have.

Alsobrook: Do you remember any specifics about that?

Bergman: There was a deposition which the President gave to a grand jury in the investigation of Robert Vestal, which was a hard one. That was first case I worked on which was very interesting but is also something I can't talk about in great detail because of Rule 6 of grand jury secrecy, but I did work in preparing the President for that deposition and had prepared a

memorandum which went in to him and in addition we had a meeting in the Oval Office the next day with Lloyd and Joe and Jody Powell and myself and the President, which was something I had never planned on. [Laughs]. It was, you know, it was nice. It was quite a thrill, I must admit, and that was the high point, one of the high points, of the year for me and we went over there and he made notations and I did a report after it was all over which he also reviewed and made notations on and also in the Billy Carter matter, there were matters which came up which we simply didn't know an answer to and the memo had to be written to go into the President for him to say what did he know, what did someone, did someone say anything to him about this and it would come back with a note on it with his handwriting, and after a while you just sort of got used to it. It didn't happen a great deal, but it happened enough that getting something back like that, it was still a thrill but it wasn't as exciting as the first time. So, it did happen.

Alsobrook: That sort of thing encourages you to always do your best, I guess.

Bergman: It also makes me sure if it's really going in or not. Sometimes Lloyd has taken items in with him that I had prepared just for Lloyd which he takes in to show and I always sit and wonder what else could I have done or how I might have done that differently, but again, we don't have a lot of time to worry about it.

Alsobrook: You know of the, of all the things you've worked on, Barbara, are there certain things that you feel like, when they happened, in the back of your mind, you may have thought, "well this is really something historical?" Has that ever happened to you?

Bergman: It has and in a sense it's happened quite a bit. One is the deposition. That's not done very often. The other was the Billy Carter, simply because I am sure it will not be a big splash in the history books, but it's the sort of thing that will be mentioned.

Alsobrook: You've talked about the Billy Carter thing. So do you think you made a big splash in history?

Bergman: It was the sort of thing will probably, people will comment on for a while. Another thing, it is not a particular incident, but being here during the Presidential election year and being able to watch how that's handled and know people who are involved with a lot of the campaigning and strategy and those sorts of decisions. That's historical and I am sure that at some point I will look back and appreciate the fact that I was here and to get an insider's view of what it was like. A lot of history. That's the main things that comes to mind, and that applies not just to the election but the idea that a lot of major world events that went on this year was the hostage crisis...

Alsobrook: Right.

Bergman: And the invasion of Afghanistan and those are the things I've observed from this vantage point rather than sitting outside and reading the paper and going to court to represent my

Nljc.oh.Bergman_B

juvenile clients in the Public Defenders Service. It's a very different perspective which you have and just knowing a lot of the people involved with all of that. I think, in my own way, that to me that will make the history of this period much more interesting.

Alsobrook: I want to ask you a little about the organization of the office here. You talked a little bit about that at the beginning. Ok this by telephone directory. Usually these don't, really, are not very accurate sometimes. But, is this essentially the way the counselor's office looks now or is this really outdated? I think that's from August.

Bergman: Yeah, this is outdated.

Alsobrook: Is it? What is the difference now?

Bergman: The senior associate counsel, Doug Huron, has taken a leave of absence to go work on the campaign, so he's not there. The two deputy counsels are the same. Patrick and I are still on here as associate counsels but we have two other associate counsels who aren't listed here who Lloyd has hired as the year went along. Well there's Phil ip Bobbitt who was a professor at the University of Texas Law School who was here as associate counsel who came on I believe in February and then Zoe Baird who formerly worked at the Office of Legal Counsel at Justice was brought over, I believe, a couple of months ago as another associate and so we now have four associates, no senior associates, and two deputies, and we also have had Al Moses.

Alsobrook: Yeah, I was going to ask you about Al. Was he brought on just to work on the Billy Carter thing?

Bergman: Yeah. He was brought on as special counsel for the Billy Carter matter because Lloyd Cutler was involved in a peripheral way in the whole thing from the standpoint that he recommended to Billy that he hire an attorney. So you know that...

Alsobrook: Excuse me, if you can say this on tape.

Bergman: I don't mind

Alsobrook: If it's ok with me, its's XX

Berger: [Laughs] ?? hopefully won't mind.

He came out as special counsel for that and took over Joe's office over here because he needed physical proximity because a lot of issues came up quickly and had to be dealt with quickly. He's still over here because we still have the on-going investigation from the Justice Department Office of Professional Responsibility and also because it's become much easier for him to just work here every day, everything is set up here for him, at least for the next few weeks and he's also helped out on a few other issues that have come up as the special counsel. So that, the Billy

Carter fund is phasing out at this point. I am not sure how much longer he is actually going to be able to give it effort, but that's the structure at the moment.

Alsobrook: How about the people who worked on SALT? Have they gone on to other things now?

Bergman: Mark Ramee and Polly Thompson are still here. SALT sort of comes and goes. I have not worked on it. I'm not sure what the status is. Ever so often there is talk of reviving it. I know the latest I saw was talk of reviving it during a lame duck session of the Congress and Senate.

Alsobrook: Oh, yes.

Bergman: And I think there is still hope of getting it approved at some point. The priority is not there at the moment and I know, I'm not sure of his exact schedule, but he's certainly not spending much time that I know of on it at the moment.

Alsobrook: When he first got here though, he was spending a lot of time on SALT.

Bergman: He actually, he started working on SALT before he ever came on as counsel to the President and I'm not sure of the exact time table there. He had worked on an international fisheries treaty with Canada which was one of the first things he had done for the President and then he was asked, I believe, and I may have this wrong, he was asked whether he wanted to be an Assistant Secretary of State and turned it down, saying that, you know, he didn't really want to do that, didn't know that much about it, but that he would be interested in working on SALT. And he was taken up on that [Laughs] and put to work and did a great deal of work trying to get the SALT treaty passed and ratified by the Senate before, again, the invasion of Afghanistan pretty much put a stop to that for a while. And by that time, he was already counsel to the President and had a great many other things to worry about other than the SALT Treaty, though I am sure he still strongly supports it and would like to see it ratified if that could be done.

Alsobrook: You know, in terms of the organization of the office in terms of communication among members of the staff, do you have a staff meeting procedure that you follow or do you do it by memo, by telephone, or face to face? [Bergman laughs.]

Bergman: I laugh because we used to try to have staff meetings and they would get rescheduled five or six times and we'd finally give up because to get five or six attorneys who are working as varied topics with as many meetings and deadlines as they all had, it became virtually impossible to get even four of them in one room together at the same time. And it may not be quite as difficult now, things seem to be a little bit quieter, but that plus Mr. Cutler's schedule, which is often totally filled, made it almost impossible to have staff meetings. Once in a while some of the staff would get together when we were working on particular areas or issues and be able to Nljc.oh.Bergman_B

discuss it, but in terms or weekly or regular staff meetings with all the attorneys or just the whole office in toto, it was virtually impossible. So we...

Alsobrook: Excuse me, sorry, I got a warning-

End of Tape One

Tape two

Bergman: Perhaps Lloyd was in a better position to wander in when he had a few spare moments than I am because my office is way over here and unless I camped outside Lloyd's door, it would be very difficult and so I checked with Joe and if he would get a break he would try to mention something to Lloyd, and that meant if I really had to talk to Lloyd, I would camp outside the door or I would make a phone call and he was very accessible, given the fact that he was so busy. If he had a moment and he wasn't busy, his door was open. You could just walk in and discuss whatever was on your mind.

Alsobrook: Lloyd? With Lloyd?

Bergman: Yeah. Which was very nice. He was a great person to work for.

Alsobrook: Are you going back to a private practice now?

Bergman: I'm going back to the Public Defenders field, is really what I... I liked it and it was court work and I'd only been there a year and normally they ask for a three year commitment. And the reason for that is because it takes about that amount of time to go through the whole rotation program, from juvenile court to misdemeanors to felonies 2 to felonies 1, and I had gotten to the juvenile and left and there is a lot more that I want to learn about practicing in court. And one of the problems with this office is that you never need to go to court. The Justice Department handles the litigation and you sit here and read documents as to whether or not you have executive privilege and it is more of a vicarious experience and thrill doing that than it is getting to court with your own cases and I miss that and I'd like to get back to that.

Alsobrook: Sounds like you are more interested in juvenile legal practice. Is that right?

Bergman: I like it. It is hard to make a living at it. [Both laugh.] There aren't many places like PDS where you actually get paid a salary and do it. Well not too many places where you can do exclusively juvenile law and make as much money as law and at PDS you do it for a year and then you go on to do the rest, so even there you don't really specialize that much, but I do like it. If I could find an opportunity to practice a lot of juvenile law I wouldn't object at all.

Alsobrook: Well, then, something else, I'm still not really clear, from an historical standpoint, that is, ok, Joe Onek and Mike Cardoza, were, could you tell me a little more about the division

of responsibilities, like you know, what types of things would Joe work on and what types of things would Michael work on?

Bergman: About the only clear cut distinction I think I can draw is that Michael tended to do a lot of the administrative work at the office. He would be the one who would be in charge of the paperwork in terms of hiring and personnel and pay raises and all of that kind of thing. And then beyond that to the substantive matters, Michael moved quite a, had done conflicts and clearances. Joe's never done that. Joe applied to come in as Deputy Counsel to work for Lloyd, had worked on the domestic policy staff, primarily in health care, and that was his background, so if projects came along that fit into either of those categories, Michael and Joe would take over the appropriate project, but I also think that a lot didn't fit into either, I mean Joe ended up doing the Olympic boycott ...

Alsobrook: Oh, yeah.

Bergman: And Michael ended up doing a lot of permit and demonstration questions which would come up and from there on it was sort of who had time and who was interested in working on whatever issue was current at the time.

Alsobrook: I remember reading an article, I think, in the New York Times that said that, I think this was probably during the primary season, when they were trying to make sure that a trip was either political or....

Bergman: That's right. Mike was the expert on that, not Joe. Michael and Doug Huron when he was here in the office and now Bill Luck is taking over a lot of it, and Mike Berman and Peter McCormick in the Vice President's Counsel Office were the people who primarily hashed out all the guidelines and memos for staff on the distinctions between official and political trips and what would be paid for from where in an effort to be extremely cautious so that we could never be accused of violating the intent of the election laws and we also had the poor people who would answer questions. I remember when the, when all these issues first started coming up they would whip up these exhaustive memos on what could and could not be done and by whom and in what conditions, then we had meetings with everybody. And it was a requirement that you go to one of these briefings where all these materials were distributed and explained and that took a lot of time. Almost...

Alsobrook: Oh gosh, uh, let's see. I think you answered the question I had.

Bergman: It's hard to break up by subject matter.

Alsobrook: Sure.

Bergman: It is so much a question of who had the time when the problem arose. You kind of get stuck with, that's how I got stuck with Billy Carter. I was the one person on the staff of the

associates who had a little time and was able to put things on the back burner for a while and do that full time.

Alsobrook: Erin Wilson, we've had some dealings with her, set up a room down in 115, but who else was involved in all that procedure?

Bergman: Uh....a lot. What happened was as soon as the Billy Carter matter really started getting a lot of press play and a subcommittee was set up, we realized that we were facing a tremendous problem in collecting documents and organizing them so that they were readily retrievable. And we're talking about thousands of documents.

Alsobrook: Right.

Bergman: And Al Moses had the advantage of being from Covington and Baugh, a big law firm in town who handled, which handles massive litigation and was used to controlling paper and having it organized, and so he was able to bring over one of the paralegals from the law firm, Ann Wilson, who had a lot of experience with organizing files, files with lots and lots of documents and so she was able to take a leave from the firm and come over here as a consultant and organize for us all of those papers. If it hadn't been for Ann I don't know how we would have managed because she set up a system that was stream lined and you could find your things quickly and I would call her up and five minutes later she would have the document I wanted and that was something which, quite frankly the rest of the file system around here leaves a lot to be desired and Ann, she spoiled me rotten, but she was very good at that, but at the same time there were so many documents that had to be brought in and Xeroxed and organized by all the different subject files, witness files, chronological files, she needed a lot of help. And we needed people with clearances because a lot of the documents were classified and we would grab people who had necessary clearances who we knew from different areas and put them to work down in 115 with Anne, literally 20 hours a day, 24 hours some days, seven days a week until that place got organized with all the documents and the first couple of weeks they were totally swamped because all the things had piled up,

Alsobrook: Uh huh.

Bergman: So we probably had, between people working with Anne, people working with us typing. again, we had secretaries here almost around the clock for seven days a week for a period of a couple of weeks when the reports for the Senate and House of Representatives were being completed, and Xeroxed and collated and all of that was done, I would say probably 30 people in the course of those five or six weeks, who worked with us. In fact, the President had even met with a group that had been involved with it after the August 4 report was filed. And they had everybody go over to the Roosevelt Room and the President and Jody Powell dropped by and thanked everyone and shook hands and had their picture taken with the whole group.

Alsobrook: You were there for that?

Nljc.oh.Bergman_B

Bergman: I was there for that. That's [laughs] And that was nice. People had worked very hard and that showed he appreciated all the time and effort. It made it worthwhile for a lot of them, so when you asked how many people helped.

Alsobrook: About 30.

Bergman: About 30. That is a long answer to your short question.

Alsobrook: No, that's fine. Because you have so many, we'll probably end up getting, you know, all those records at the Presidential Library. We went down in a van one day and she showed us the filing system, so... OK, let's see. You've just about covered every question I've asked. I'll tell you what, I'm not trying to cover every single thing that you've done here, but do you feel like, is there anything that you have worked on that you feel like is really important that we haven't even touched on about your job here?

Bergman: Some things I didn't have particularly very much role in, but I watched policy being formulated. A couple stick in my mind. One in particular was with the Love Canal. I was particularly involved in going to meetings and coordinating some of that, and this was the time when the decision had to be made fairly quickly because a chromosomal study had been made indicating chromosome damage for people who lived near Love Canal and the decision had to be made on whether they would be evacuated and relocated and who would pay for it, and I remember sitting in a meeting with Jack Watson and a lot of people and for once, instead of sitting around and agonizing over money and, you know, implications from the political standpoint and all this inter-agency bickering, I heard Jack Watson saying we're talking about human beings and we're going to make a decision in light of that. And it was really nice to me to hear somebody that close to the President that concerned about an issue affecting people and realizing that's what is was. You could talk money and you could talk chemical companies and you could talk lawsuits all you wanted, but when you got right down to it, we're talking human beings' lives and the fact that kind of attitude and concern came across at other times, I found very refreshing and very comforting in a lot of ways. and what I mean, I think I will appreciate the fact that there are some people scattered in different places with that kind of attitude and kind of value system and that makes me feel good being a part of that. That's my high point, I guess.

Alsobrook: Have you ever thought about what kind of law you would like to be doing, say ten years from now?

Bergman: Hmmm. I guess I'm more people oriented. It guess the last answer would reflect that. I would like to be doing the kind of law where you help people and I think that leaves me fairly wide open, whether it be juvenile law or law for the handicapped, or mental health issues, or, that's always been sort of my leaning, and I think that's probably what I would be doing.

Alsobrook: OK. And the last question. These are really long. Could you give me a permanent address and telephone number where somebody on the part of the President's Library contact you in several years from now?

Bergman: I will give you my parents' address. My father's name is Herman Bergman. The address is Rural Route # 3, Cameron Lane, C A M E R O N, Lane, Peoria, Illinois. And zip is 61607. And they should know where I am.

Alsobrook: Do you have an alumni association that we could contact years from now who might have an address for you?

Bergman: Stanford Law School Alumni Association might have. They're pretty good at tracking me down to ask for money. [Laughs] Trying to think...

Alsobrook: Well, thank you for this time.

Bergman: You are so welcome.

Alsobrook: It has been almost an hour.

Bergman: It has been a nice opportunity to sit for a while.

Alsobrook: You know, if you think of something else we didn't quite cover, just give me a call and I will come back here and spend another half hour with you. I know your time is pretty valuable here at the end. So just give me a call and let me know. Like I told you, someday we may come back and want to ask more probing questions, but that's not the purpose of this interview. Thank you.